



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,540	07/09/2003	Sai Kiang Lim	4810-66314	8220

7590 05/10/2005

One World Trade Center
Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, OR 97204

EXAMINER

BARNHART, LORA ELIZABETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1651

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/618,540

Applicant(s)

LIM, SAI KIANG

Examiner

Lora E. Barnhart

Art Unit

1651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

RD

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-5, drawn to a purified preparation of mammalian hemangioblast cells, classified in class 435, subclass 325.
- II. Claims 6-12, drawn to a method of preparing a mammalian hemangioblast cell line and the product of said method, classified in class 435, subclass 325.
- III. Claim 13, drawn to a method for inducing formation of new blood vessels in an ischemic tissue, classified in class 435, subclass 325.
- IV. Claim 14, drawn to a method of enhancing blood vessel formation in ischemic tissue, classified in class 435, subclass 325.
- V. Claim 15, drawn to a method for treating an injured blood vessel, classified in class 435, subclass 325.
- VI. Claim 16, drawn to a method of delivering a therapeutic gene to a patient having a condition amenable to gene therapy, classified in class 435, subclass 362.
- VII. Claim 17, drawn to a kit comprising human hemangioblast cells, modified so that the cells carry a therapeutic gene, classified in class 435, subclass 362.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are drawn to a product and a process that does not necessarily make said product. The cell line of Group I is described in terms of its biological and immunological properties, while the cell line produced by the method of Group II is described in terms of its method of isolation. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the literature search required for Group I is not required for Group II (and *vice versa*), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Inventions VII and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product of Group VII is drawn broadly to hemangioblast cells that express some exogenous gene, and said cells may be useful for *in vitro* investigations of the selected gene's function in the differentiation of hemangioblasts to other cell types. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the literature search required for Group VI is not required for Group VII, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Groups II-VI are directed to methods that are distinct both physically and functionally, and are not required one for the other. Group II is a method of making a

Art Unit: 1651

hemangioblast cell line, and Groups III-VI are drawn to methods of using hemangioblasts that are not necessarily made by the process of Group II. Furthermore, the methods of Groups III and VI require the use of different cell lines than do the methods of Groups IV and V. Groups III and IV are both drawn to inducing blood vessel formation, but Group III is specifically claimed for use on ischemic tissue, so the patient populations treatable by the methods of Groups III and IV are distinct. The methods of Groups V and VI are distinct from each other and from the methods of Groups III and IV because they have different end points, use different starting materials, and are practiced on diverse patient populations. For at least these reasons, a search and examination of all five methods in one patent application would result in an undue burden, since the searches for the methods are not co-extensive, the classification is different, and the subject matter is divergent.

Groups I and VII are directed to products that are distinct both physically and functionally, are not required one for the other, and are therefore patentably distinct. The product of Group VII comprises cells expressing some therapeutic gene, while the product of Group I does not recite or imply such a limitation. In addition, the cells of Group VII are specifically claimed to be human, while the cells of Group I may be from any mammal. Therefore, a search and examination of both products in one patent application would result in an undue burden, since the searches for the products are not co-extensive, the classification is different, and the subject matter is divergent.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Sources of hemangioblast cells: (a) a delayed mammalian blastocyst, (b) an early post-implantation embryo together with its extra-embryonic tissues, (c) an embryonic stem cell-derived embryoid body, and (d) bone marrow tissue.

Mammals: (e) humans and (f) all other mammals.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. That is, applicant should elect ONE source of hemangioblasts from (a)-(d) above and ONE mammal from (e) and (f) above. Currently, claims 1-12 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the

case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of M.P.E.P. § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 C.F.R. 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 C.F.R. 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not

Art Unit: 1651

commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to maintain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the protection against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See M.P.E.P. § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lora E. Barnhart whose telephone number is 571-272-1928. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lora E Barnhart



SANDRA E. SAUCIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

